The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was <u>not</u> written for publication in a law journal and is <u>not</u> binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 23

rlm

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CZLIAM

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

OCT 0 9 2001

PAIL OFFICE BOARD OF PATENT AFFEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte JOHANNES B.A. VAN DER HOOFDEN and JOZEF W.J. MAES

Appeal No. 2000-0706 Application No. 08/675,665

ORDER REMANDING TO EXAMINER

Appellants filed an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) on July 3, 1996 (Paper No. 5). It is not clear from the record whether the examiner considered the statement submitted or whether the examiner notified appellants of why their submission did not meet the criteria set forth in 37 CFR §§ 1.97 and 1.98.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is remanded to the examiner for consideration of the IDS filed July 3, 1996 (Paper No. 5), notification to appellants in writing of consideration and for such further action as may be appropriate.

Application No. 08/675,665

It is important that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences be informed promptly of any action affecting the status of the appeal (i.e., abandonment, issue, reopening prosecution).

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

By:

DALE M. SHAW

Program and Resource Administrator

(703) 308-9797

DMS:clm

Appeal No. 2000-0706 Application No. 08/675,665

Corporate Patent Counsel U.S. Philips Corp. 580 White Plains Road Tarrytown, NY 10591